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Based on an article of the same title by John M. Bryson, Fran Ackermann, and Colin Eden forthcoming in *Public Administration Review.*
Why collaborate?

• Collaborative advantage – identifies what organizations can achieve together that they cannot achieve easily by themselves.
But...

• The literature is essentially silent on exactly how to discover collaborative advantage.

  ▪ The literature is also essentially silent on how to achieve via collaboration public value-oriented goals beyond those for which organizations are willing to be held accountable.
This shortcoming may be addressed through:

• The idea of goals systems and a set of goal categories that may be used to help articulate collaborative advantage and

• The use of visual strategy mapping as part of a facilitated group strategy-making process to figure out the details of the possible collaborative advantage present in specific cases.
Goals *systems* and six goal categories

- Core goals
- Core goals shared across organizations (shared core goals)
- Public value goals beyond shared core goals
- Negative-avoidance goals (“let’s avoid disaster goals”)
- Negative public value consequences beyond core goals
- Not-my-goals
Case 2 – A government regulator and utility company identify a public value-oriented collaborative advantage

- Create facilities that lead the way in carbon reduction in our country
- At the end, members of the public, skilled, proud & keen on doing more, leaving a skills legacy; provide a social benefit to the community
- Meet the expectations of the locals (who can see the facilities) as well as the wider populace; no long term environmental problems
- Build facilities to cost and create a viable export market [core goal for Utility]
- Satisfy the government’s desire for security of supply
- Have profitable utility [core goal for Utility]
- ALL STAKEHOLDERS [inc the public] RETAIN CONFIDENCE in the REGULATORY PROCESS ACROSS ALL INDUSTRIES
- Develop greater public confidence in the Regulator [core goal for Regulator]
- Ensure the public and all stakeholders view the development of the new facilities as a positive idea
- Ensure a low risk as possible design
- Regulator provides timely, proportionate, targeted and balanced regulation, advice, and assessment [core goal for Regulator]
- Ensure competent and capable Licensee organization; ensure licensee organizations manage safety effectively
- Inherently meet or exceed all Regulator regulations by our own design/methods so that Utility Co set and meet own expectations
- Completion of safe and effective construction of new facilities & during construction where the Regulator avoids unnecessarily delaying project schedule
- Build facilities that are the envy of the world & set the world standard for construction - their location becomes a centre of excellence
- Ensure that the facilities will be safe, reliable & secure over its entire life to meet our context in a fit for purpose way
- Build quality better than existing facilities
- Get facilities that are leading safety
- NOT ‘the lights go out’
- Continuously learn and improve as we move forward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Type/Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core goals (primary)</td>
<td>Goals that are at the core of, or central to an organization achieving its mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared core goals</td>
<td>Core goals shared by more than one organization made possible through collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public value goals beyond core goals</td>
<td>Goals valued by the public which extend beyond any organization’s core goals and shared core goals and for which no organization is willing to be held accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative-avoidance goals</td>
<td>Goals which are possible negative consequences of strategies to achieve other goals, and thus are risks that need to be assessed and possibly managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative public value consequences beyond core goals</td>
<td>Undesirable public value consequences generated by pursuing strategies to achieve core goals and shared core goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-my-goals</td>
<td>Goals of other organizations that an organization is not prepared to be held accountable for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative advantage

- As *normally* understood, collaborative advantage consists of shared core goals
- A *broader, public value-focused* approach to collaborative advantage consists of:
  - Shared core goals
  - Public value goals beyond core goals
  - Negative-avoidance goals ("let’s avoid disaster goals") – in some circumstances
  - Negative public value consequences beyond core goals
  - Not-my-goals – in some circumstances
Visual strategy mapping

• Visual strategy mapping a causal mapping process.

• A causal map is a statement-and-arrows diagram in which ideas are causally linked to one another through the use of arrows. The arrows indicate how one idea or action leads to another in a means-ends relationship.

• In a visual strategy map (a subset of causal maps) the statements represent actions that, if taken, are presumed to cause a given outcome(s).
Visual Strategy Maps Are Word-and-Arrow Diagrams

The arrows mean “may lead to” or “will result in”
To Work Down a Chain of Arrows:

• Keep asking, “How would I do that?” or “What would it take to do that?”
• The arrows should lead *from* “how” you would do something *to* what you want to accomplish
To Work Up a Chain of Arrows:

• Keep asking, “What would happen if I did that?” or “What would the consequences be if I did that?”
• The arrows should go from what you might do to the consequences of doing it.
Case 1 – A metropolitan police force identifies the importance of collaborating.
Case 2 – A government regulator and utility company identify a public value-oriented collaborative advantage

At the end, members of the public, skilled, proud & keen on doing more, leaving a skills legacy; provide a social benefit to the community.

Create facilities that lead the way in carbon reduction in our country.

Build facilities that are a world leader, that operate reliably, & that make our populace proud of what we have done.

Build quality better than existing facilities.

Inherently meet or exceed all Regulator regulations by our own design/methods so that Utility Co see & meet own expectations.

Ensure the facilities will be safe, reliable & secure over its entire life to meet our context in a fit for purpose way.

Ensure that the completion of safe and effective construction of new facilities, & DURING CONSTRUCTION where the Regulator avoids UNNECESSARILY delaying project schedule.

Ensure ‘as low a risk as possible’ design.

In the end, members of the public, skilled, proud & keen on doing more, leaving a skills legacy; provide a social benefit to the community.

Have profitable utility [core goal for Utility].

Satisfy the government’s desire for security of supply.

Regulator gains wider stakeholder confidence in its work & meet political expectations without compromising mission & values [core goal for Regulator].

Ensure the public and all stakeholders view the development of the new facilities as a positive idea.

ALL STAKEHOLDERS (ie the public) RETAIN CONFIDENCE in the REGULATORY PROCESS ACROSS ALL INDUSTRIES.
Conclusions

• The main contributions of this approach:
  • Relevant goal categories
  • An explicit, operational way for collaborators to figure out collaborative advantage
Conclusions – cont.

• And a caution that single-minded focus by public organizations on meeting their core goals alone can significantly diminish their potential for creating public value
Conclusions, cont.

• **Proposition 1.** In comparison with normal dialogue, potential collaborators using visual strategy mapping as part of a facilitated group strategy mapping session will have
  • (1) a clearer, more complete, and systemic understanding of exactly what the potential collaborative advantage is, as that term is ordinarily understood;
  • (2) how they might achieve it and with what risks; and
  • (3) therefore have a better basis for deciding whether to proceed.
Conclusions, cont.

• **Propositions 2.** Potential collaborators using visual strategy mapping as part of a facilitated group strategy mapping session will have:
  • (1) a clearer understanding of the potential collaborative advantage that *goes beyond* core goals and shared core goals to create *greater public value*;
  • (2) how they might achieve it and with what risks; and
  • (3) therefore have a better basis for deciding whether to proceed.
Conclusions, cont.

• Testing the propositions will be a challenge for research:
  • comparative case studies
  • natural experiments
  • laboratory experiments
  • quantitative and qualitative data
To learn more about visual strategy mapping

**VISUAL STRATEGY**

*strategy mapping* for public and nonprofit organizations

JOHN M. BRYSON · FRAN ACKERMANN · COLIN EDEN

illustrations by RAMÓN CARR

WILEY
To learn more about visual strategy mapping – cont.

• [http://www.hubertproject.org/hubert-material/402/](http://www.hubertproject.org/hubert-material/402/)
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